DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 834 SP 008 202

AUTHOR Marsh, David D.
TITLE Issues Concerning Teacher Centers: Research and Development-Is There a Role?
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 9p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association (59th, Chicago, Illinois, April 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Development; *Educational Research; *Educational Trends; Effective Teaching; Instructional Staff; Organization; Policy; Role Perception; *Teacher Centers; Teacher Employment

ABSTRACT

This speech focuses on the role that research and development can and will play in the planning and operation of teacher centers over the next few years. The speech is divided into three sections for the three critical issues that are discussed: a) issues concerning policy analysis related to teacher centers, b) issues in the development and operation of local teacher centers that relate to research and development, and c) issues concerning teacher centers as vehicles for research on teacher effectiveness. Specifically, the first section reviews the current teacher surplus, current staff sizes, and financial limitations in staffing. The second section stresses the need for some "Vince Lombardis in Program Development"; Lombardi's football success came from a careful analysis of strategy--the efforts of his team, the opponent team, the weather, the press. Section 3 considers teacher centers as vehicles for discussing competencies which ought to be required for state certification. The author summarizes by expressing his view that in the future teacher centers will be involved in policy analysis and organization development and research issues, but not in the conduct of teacher effectiveness. (JA)

ED 093834

Issues Concerning Teacher Centers: Research And Development-Is There A Role?

David D. Marsh
Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corp.
Berkeley, California

Presented at the
American Educational Research Association
1974 Annual Convention
Chicago, Illinois

April 15-19, 1974

SP 008 202

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

This paper will focus on the role that research and development can and will play in the planning and operation of teacher centers over the next few years. I specifically want to address several issues which I see as critical to the success of teacher centers in the near future. The paper will address three kinds of R & D issues.

1. Issues concerning policy analysis related to teacher centers.

2. Issues in the development and operation of local teacher centers that relate to R & D.

3. Issues concerning teacher centers as vehicles for research on teacher effectiveness.

Issues Concerning Policy Analysis Related To Teacher Centers

A number of policy studies of teacher centers have already been done. These are:

- A book entitled Teachers For The Real World, edited by B.O. Smith, which reported a conception of a teacher center and raised many important issues regarding the application of educational theory to support effective teaching. The book, among other things, led to a U.S.O.E. focus on protocal and training materials development.

- A report of the Ad Hoc National Advisory Committee on Training Complexes which suggested a range of guideline alternatives and reported proposed teacher centers for four institutional settings. The report also contained an excellent analysis of potential problems and dilemmas facing teacher centers.

- Working papers from a national study committee on teacher centers and educational renewal sites, chaired by B.O. Smith. The study committee was made up of national leaders in teacher education including David Selden, President of one AFT who along with David Darland of the National Education Association wrote a stimulating paper on the questions of governance and power in teacher centers. As part of the Committee's effort, I prepared an explication of issues concerning teacher centers and educational renewal sites.

- The next year Ben Rosner chaired a committee which considered teacher centers in the broader context of competency-based teacher education and soon thereafter B.O. Smith directed a summer institute that examined teacher centers, educational renewal and a host of related ideas.

- All during this time, a series of outside experts provided continual advice to USOE about teacher centers and related activities through committees called, however inaccurate the title, Leadership Training Institutes. At the same time, U.S.O.E. officials and others visited teacher centers in England, Japan and other countries. Al Schnieder played a major role in guiding these activities.

- Even though Federal funding of teacher centers appears to have been terminated, policy thinking about teacher centers has continued. The spring issue of The Journal of Teacher Education this year is devoted to teacher centers and Sam Yarger is conducting a baseline study of teacher centers across the country.

My point in reviewing this series of events is to illustrate the extent of policy thinking about teacher centers. For the most part it has been of excellent quality and I know of very few federal programs that began with such careful consideration of basic issues. This policy thinking will be very helpful to the development of local teacher centers even though large scale federal support has ended.

Yet a critical task remains for policy thinkers as they ponder teacher centers. This task is to analyze teacher centers in the light of some important changes taking place in schools of education and public schools.

Many universities and specifically schools of education are experiencing financial stresses. The size of the staff is the same from year to year whereas in the 60's the staff was growing in size. This problem increases in complexity when the teacher surplus is considered in juncture with the financial pressure in schools of education. For many schools of education staff size is based on the numbers of student enrolled in education programs. While it might be reasonable to resolve the oversupply of beginning teachers by limiting enrollment in schools of education; this becomes less "reasonable" for school of education administrators when a significant cut in staff is the result. The dilemma is a real one given that the budget of a school of education is larely for staff and very specialized staff at that. What, for example, does an

English education professor do when his class load is cut? While theoretical answers exist the question demands practical answers as well. A dean faces a faculty where the average age is increasing due to limited numbers of new faculty. The dean has to contend with a faculty where the average amount of time since professors were active in public school classrooms seems to be increasing. Moreover, the role identity of the professor has been established after several years without field experience. This is not to say that professors are not flexible. However, the Corwin study, (1973), does report that it is the young liberal who are involved in public schools. I have observed, in addition, that the innovative federally funded Teacher Corps. training programs of the 60's were staffed by younger, non-tenured faculty of special appointment faculty. While schools of education are increasingly interested in inservice education and teacher centers, I want to point out that there are structural circumstances in schools of education that mitigate against this thrust.

At the same time public schools face changed issues, also. As in the case with schools of education, the average age of public school staffs will probably increase by one year for each calendar year in the next 5 years because of the decreased numbers of new staff being hired and decreased faculty mobility. The schools, of course, are also in a financial stress period as are universities. I look at innovations in public schools in the 1960's. I see that innovation came in several ways:

- New school buildings and new staff patterns
- Large scale curriculum efforts
- Young staff who could relate to students, especially to junior high and high school students.

I wonder where innovations in public schools will come from in the 1970's as survival becomes a more important issue. Certainly the willingness of teachers to demand that they be active participants on school renewal is important but given no new schools and the financial bind, I'm not sure what will develop.

We've learned from the '60's that school reform must integrate curriculum, staff training and administration processes. Large scale curriculum projects that sought to be "teacher proof" just were not successful.

I see teacher centers as an exciting vehicle for both schools of education and public schools to work together. I want to point out, however, that the issues of cooperative venture, of a revised, more inservice-minded mission for schools of education and of public school renewal are complex issues that are quite structural in nature. I believe this problem is one of the two most important research and development issues facing the Teacher Corps. movement.

Issues in the Development and Operation of Local Teacher Centers That Relate to Research and Development

The issue I've just discussed is a "real" issue for local teacher centers as well as a policy issue for those persons taking a broader view of teacher centers. There are other research and development issues facing local teacher center projects, however. The issue I'd like to focus on here is based on the assumption that teacher center projects will, in general, continue to be fairly informal, teacher self-help mechanisms, where the essential research and development issues are more in the nature of organizational development and ideas or materials dissemination, rather than in the nature of formalized, objective-based training or instructional research. Rather than analyze why I believe issues of organizational development and dissemination will be the most critical issues, I want to focus on the relationship of those issues to teacher centers. As Corwin has pointed out in his review of the literature most studies of institutional change and organizational development are studies of complex institutions where the change was not deliberate. Instead, he characterized the institutional change process as a dialectic response to a severe organizational stress. One important research and development issue for teacher centers is now to construe organizational development where change

change is deliberate and where institutional stress is less than catastrophic. But when I say that the change is deliberate, I don't mean that change is to be construed in the usual concepts of systems theory applied to education where first one identifies objectives and then one implements a program to meet these objectives. This notion of development is far too linear to be viable for many teacher centers in the near future.

A related research and development issue is that many persons involved in program development in education do not (or are not able to) view what they do in a scholarly way. What is needed are some Vince Lombardi's in program development. Lombardi was a man of action--one who could win football games. A great part of his success in winning came from his careful analysis of strategy--the efforts of his team, the opponents team and the effects of external variables such as weather, the press, etc. In organizational development we seem to have only the two extremes:

- people who attempt to carry out program development without focused analysis of their efforts.
- people who study organizational development analytically without sufficient concern for assisting meaningful development.

Of course this generalization isn't always true--there are a few Vince Lombardi's in education's organizational development. In many instances, however, I have seen university professors, doctoral students and public school staff become involved in complex organizational change efforts until they faced the prospect of tenure, for example, at which time they decided to be scholarly and write or even think analytically about some other field.

Issues Concerning Teacher Centers As Vehicles For Research On Teacher Effectiveness

Now I want to turn to several issues concerning teacher centers as vehicles for research on teacher effectiveness. I began this paper with the statement that I wanted to focus on research and development issues that teacher centers will actually face in the next few years.

Based on this stipulation, I should probably avoid a discussion of teacher centers and research on teacher effectiveness because I don't believe that many centers will be anywhere close to being vehicles for such research.

However, there are several issues that ought to be discussed briefly. I think issues of teacher effectiveness are especially important right now given that, on the one hand, many states have adopted performance certification requirements and on the other hand, we continue to be unable to specify what the effective teacher must know or do. David Potter, in an article on teacher behavior and student achievement in the March, 1974 issue of the performance-based teacher education newsletter, is the latest in a series of reviewers of research to make this point.[1]

While teacher centers may not be vehicles for research on teacher effectiveness in many cases, they will be vehicles for discussing what competencies teachers ought to be required for state certification. Teacher centers in Texas have taken on this function. Yet the great interest in assessment of teacher performance only, strengthens my senses that the role of R & D for teacher centers is most fruitfully in the area of conducting new research in teacher effectiveness rather than in interpreting current research for decision-makers choosing the teacher competencies currently to be required.

I would like to close with a few thoughts about the direction of this proposed research and the potential role teacher centers can play in conducting this research, even though, as I said before, I don't see many teacher centers involved in this research in the near future.

[1] David A. Potter "Teacher Behavior and Student Achievement" PBTE, a newsletter published by the Multi-State Consortium on Performance-based Teacher Education. Vol. 2, No. 9, March, 1974.

The opening paragraphs in the latest PBTE newsletter contain these words: "Possibly the one unifying concern shared by everyone in performance (competency-based) teacher education is assessment. How does one measure teacher effectiveness? Critics of performance education say that research must be done to establish relationships between teach competencies and student learning. We agree!!" But in considering issues of measurement we face other issues in the teacher effectiveness research:

1. The teacher/pupil interactive research often seems to ignore other aspects of the instructional process goals, etc. The research is done as if teacher and pupil sat on two ends of a log talking to each other. On the other hand, research on educational technology has tried to systematically rule out the effects of the teacher. Whatever value these research approaches had or have, we obviously also need research where materials, teacher, pupil groupings and instructional objectives are systematically related. I find the classroom observation guide developed by Jane Stallings and collegues at The Stanford Research Institute to be a very promising device in this regard.

2. The research on teacher effectiveness will necessitate an in-depth study of classroom behavior. Many of the recent studies of teacher effectiveness were funded as part of federal program evaluations which in turn usually meant that data collection was nation-wide, quite expensive and relatively superficial in its overall design. I see teacher centers as negotiating mechanisms whereby teachers and researchers can work out arrangements whereby this research can be carried out. Many issues are involved in this negotiation as can be easily imagined. I feel that the issue of teacher trust of the research process and reciprocity of benefits for all involved are critical.

In summary, I have discussed three clusters of issues:

- o policy analysis issues
- o organizational development and dissemination issues
- o teacher effectiveness research issues

In the near future, I see teacher centers being involved in the first two issues but probably not in the conduct of teacher effectiveness.